



## Pape, Zachary

---

**From:** Arbes, Carl  
**Sent:** Monday, February 07, 2005 1:20 PM  
**To:** Pape, Zachary  
**Subject:** RE: 10808358

Hello Mr Pape,

It appears that claims 16-24 would be classifiable in 29/832 and the claim 25 (which has to be a means-plus-function (or apparatus) and not a method claim would be in 29/739. (you will note that applicant's attorney is quite creative with claim 25. It appears that s/he should have recited ...A means of..., or An apparatus of.. or the like!!

If I were you I would restrict 3 ways. The method claims do not require a plurality of external walls..Moreover the Group III invention (Claim 25) is not required to manufacture the Group I (article) or Group II (method claims 16-24) since one can just as well perform the method by hand..

Have a nice day,

Carl J. Arbes,  
Senior Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3729

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Pape, Zachary  
**Sent:** Monday, February 07, 2005 10:09 AM  
**To:** Arbes, Carl  
**Subject:** 10808358

Carl,

Please take a look at claims 16-25 to see if this is worth restricting. 1-15 are structural claims which I will examine if a restriction is done and if they are elected by the examiner.

Thanks Carl!

**Zachary M. Pape**  
AU 2835  
Jeff-8A20  
(571)-272-2201  
Zachary.Pape@uspto.gov

**Subject:** 10808358

Carl,

Please take a look at claims 16-25 to see if this is worth restricting. 1-15 are structural claims which I will examine if a restriction is done and if they are elected by the examiner.

Thanks Carl!

**Zachary M. Pape**

AU 2835

Jeff-8A20

(571)-272-2201

Zachary.Pape@uspto.gov